

## Corporate Disclosure Statement

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Table of Authorities   | iii |
| Statement in Support of Request for Oral Argument  | 1   |
| Statement of Subject Matter and Appellate Jurisdiction   | 1   |
| Statement of Issues for Review   | 2   |
| Statement of the Case  | 3   |
| Statement of Facts   | 4   |
| A. Procedural History in the State Courts  | 4   |
| B. The Charges Against Ewing in State Court  | 5   |
| C. Ewing's Post-Conviction Appeals and Motions in State Court  | 24  |
| D. Ewing's Habeas Corpus Petition  | 29  |
| Summary of Argument  | 32  |
| Argument   | 36  |
| <i>Standard of Review</i>  | 36  |
| I. PETITIONER IS ENTITLED TO VACATION OF HIS<br>CONVICTION BECAUSE EVIDENCE WITHHELD BY THE<br>STATE VIOLATED HIS RIGHTS TO DUE PROCESS OF<br>THE LAW. | 37  |
| A. The Decisions of the State Courts   | 39  |
| B. The Withheld Evidence of Ewing's Frame-Up   | 43  |
| C. The Destroyed Evidence  | 48  |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| II. THE PRETRIAL IDENTIFICATION PROCEDURES<br>UTILIZED IN THE STATE COURT PROCEEDINGS<br>VIOLATED PETITIONER'S RIGHTS TO BE FREE FROM<br>ILLEGAL SEIZURE UNDER THE FOURTH<br>AMENDMENT, HIS RIGHTS TO DUE PROCESS OF LAW<br>UNDER THE FIFTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS<br>AND HIS RIGHT TO COUNSEL UNDER THE SIXTH<br>AMENDMENT. | 53 |
| A. The Decisions of the State Courts  | 53 |
| B. Ewing was in Custody   | 55 |
| C. Placing Ewing in Custody was an Unlawful Seizure   | 56 |
| D. Ewing Should Have Been Advised of his <i>Miranda</i> Warnings<br>Because He Was in Custody   | 58 |
| E. The Suggestive Identification Procedures   | 59 |
| F. Lack of an Independent Basis for Ewing's Identification  | 62 |
| Conclusion  | 65 |
| Certificate of Service  |    |
| Addendum-Designation of Appendix Contents   |    |